

## The Honorable Ricardo S. Martinez

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

CASE NO. CR18-224-RSM

**Plaintiff,**

ORDER

V.

JOSHUA DYLAN BROOKS.

**Defendant:**

18        THIS COURT having considered the motion to continue trial date filed by the United  
19 States of America, requesting a continuance of the current trial date of June 29, and based on  
20 the facts set forth therein, and General Orders 01-20 and 08-20 of the United States District  
21 Court for the Western District of Washington re Extension of Court Operations Under the  
22 Exigent Circumstances Created by COVID-19 and Related Coronavirus, addressing  
23 measures to reduce the spread and health risks from COVID-19, which is incorporated herein  
24 by reference, and overruling any objection by the Defendant Joshua Dylan Brooks, the Court  
25 hereby FINDS that trial in this case cannot proceed on the currently scheduled date of June  
26 29, 2020. For the reasons detailed in the government's motion, and given the findings of  
27 General Order 08-20, the ends of justice served by granting a continuance outweigh the best  
28 interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

1 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(7)(A), (B)(i), (iv).

2 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the government's request to continue the trial  
3 date is GRANTED.

4 The trial date of June 29, 2020, is hereby VACATED.

5 Trial in this matter is now scheduled for October 26, 2020. Pretrial motions are due  
6 by October 1, 2020.

7 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the time between the date of the filing of the  
8 motion and the new trial date, is excluded in computing the time within which trial must  
9 commence because the ends of justice served by granting this continuance outweigh the best  
10 interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial, 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). Failure  
11 to grant this continuance would likely make trial impossible and result in a miscarriage of  
12 justice, and would deny counsel for the defendant and government counsel the reasonable  
13 time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. *Id.*  
14 § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i), (iv).

15 Dated this 29<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2020.



16  
17 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

19 Presented by:

20  
21 s/ Ye-Ting Woo

22 YE-TING WOO

23 Assistant United States Attorney

24 s/ Chantelle Dial

25 CHANTELLE DIAL

26 Assistant United States Attorney